

# NBCD RECONSTITUTION IPT MEETING, BATTELLE, NEW ORLEANS

**06/03/2003**

## 1.0 DATE AND TIME.

June 3, 2003.

## 2.0 LOCATION.

Battelle, New Orleans.

## 3.0 ATTENDEES.

**Table 1. Meeting Attendees**

Name	Organization	Email	Phone Number
Cathy Clements	Coalescent	<a href="mailto:ClementsC@ctcorp.com">ClementsC@ctcorp.com</a>	(407) 839-1980
Kevin Porche GySgt	MFR	<a href="mailto:porchekl@mfr.usmc.mil">porchekl@mfr.usmc.mil</a>	(504)678-5391
Alan Duncan Cw04	MFR	<a href="mailto:duncanda@mfr.usmc.mil">duncanda@mfr.usmc.mil</a>	(504) 678-1273
Dennis Litalien	Sverdrup	<a href="mailto:litaliendj@lejeune.usmc.mil">litaliendj@lejeune.usmc.mil</a>	(910) 330-6054
Mike Myers	Coalescent	<a href="mailto:myersm@ctcorp.com">myersm@ctcorp.com</a>	(407) 839-1980
Ann Gossage MgySgt	MCCDC	<a href="mailto:gossageam@mccdc.usmc.mil">gossageam@mccdc.usmc.mil</a>	(703) 784-6686
Martin Preston	PP&O	<a href="mailto:martinpo@hqmc.usmc.mil">martinpo@hqmc.usmc.mil</a>	(703) 396-7319
David Gibson CWO	MFP	<a href="mailto:gibsondc@mfp.usmc.mil">gibsondc@mfp.usmc.mil</a>	(808) 477-8673
Jere Brown	Sverdrup	<a href="mailto:brownjl@svtcsle.com">brownjl@svtcsle.com</a>	(703) 445-1616
Mark Keegan LtCol	MFL	<a href="mailto:keeganmp@marforlant.usmc.mil">keeganmp@marforlant.usmc.mil</a>	(757) 836-1658
Doug Redlich	Battelle	<a href="mailto:redlichdc@aol.com">redlichdc@aol.com</a>	(337) 616-1473
		<a href="mailto:redlichd@battelle.org">redlichd@battelle.org</a>	(504) 905-0758
Doug Davis	DDG	<a href="mailto:Davisda@davisdefense.com">Davisda@davisdefense.com</a>	(703) 509-4815
Larry Miller	MFR	<a href="mailto:miller@MFR.usmc.mil">miller@MFR.usmc.mil</a>	(504) 678-8415
Walter Miller	Albany	<a href="mailto:millerw@logcom.usmc.mil">millerw@logcom.usmc.mil</a>	(229) 639-6539

**Table 1. Meeting Attendees (Continued)**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Email</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>
Bob James	Albany	jamesbe@logcom.usmc.mil	

**4.0 ADMINISTRATIVE NOTES.**

None.

**5.0 SCOPE OR PURPOSE.**

To develop a generic implementation plan addressing all three Courses of Action (COAs).

**6.0 AGENDA.**

None provided.

**7.0 DISCUSSION.**

The IPT began with a discussion of the mission to develop an implementation plan for the reconstitution and consolidation of NBC assets. This was followed by an in-depth review of the Reconstitution brief; a review and subsequent revision/reformatting of a standing POA/M; a breakdown into sub-groups to address processes involved in Operating Forces impact, IT Focus, SOW/acquisition strategy; and doctrine/policy requirements. Additionally, the IPT reviewed and recommended changes to the draft PP/O message that will be released requesting MARFORS to review the brief and select/comment on a COA(s).

**7.1 Remarks.**

The idea to have the IPT write a draft implementation plan was based on team members being thoroughly familiar with the plan. Also, they needed to be in general agreement of the plan process. However, a day was taken to go over the brief and bring everyone on a somewhat "level playing field". That being said, there were numerous detailed discussions that begged a revised look at proposed implementation procedures. Nothing that was discussed, and subsequently taken for action, is a long pole in the tent for selection of a COA. There was consensus that the COAs were still relevant, but that the approach to COA implementation should be adjusted. We determined to have the IPTs draft an implementation outline, which will basically be a POA/M with milestones that need to be established in the near future.

**7.2 Proposed Change to General COA "Approach".**

This proposal directly applies to COA 1 and 3, which are those utilizing the CSF at Dallas. COA 2 will not be affected since there is no CSF. The key to the new approach is:

- 1) There is a requirement to maintain a standing contingency block (MAGTF in nature) that is put together at a MEF area facility before any unit equipment is shipped to the CSF.
- 2) There is a requirement to implement T/A from available assets for each unit prior to assets being shipped to the CSF.
- 3) CONUS implementation should be MEF sequential vice concurrent.
- 4) TAV (IT/AIT) capability should be part of MEF facility site contingency block and the T/A distribution setup (capability has to be tested, on the shelf, and available when required). Need to develop a detailed list of requirements that specifies all performance and interface requirements for TAV. To do this, we will need to complete the development of all stock, store, issue, and reporting processes. With the emphasis on Web DEMP, IPT members need access and a demo as soon as possible.

### **7.3 New COA 3 Approach Example.**

MEF priority for reconstitution established (by PP/O) is as follows:

- Central Facility and I MEF facility standup.
- I MEF facility is the focal point for receiving unit equipment via a joint inventory to include record jackets/copy of DEMP. For example, a facility on Camp Pendleton pulls tenant units, then outlying bases like 29 Palms, Yuma, Miramar.
- CLS Team (combo of CLS and Active Duty 57XX) pulls/inspects/tags/gains TAV/packages gear to establish contingency blocks (MEUs and some type of MAGTF capability – up to the MEF G-3). The same for T/A.
- Remaining gear shipped to CSF to replenish/replace/repair/calibrate/tagged/tariff.
- II MEF facility has been activated and above requirements accomplished.
- Pending availability of new buys, assets first, shipped to CSF. It is then tagged/gain TAV, onward to MEFs as part of reconstitution package.
- Priority and on-hand stock level established for MEF main facility and satellite bases (pending availability of industrial base and status of gear returning from theatre) may have to use all USMC assets as pool from which to draw. Ensure all MEFs have a prioritized capability, if not, below 2 bullets are executed.
- MARFORRES reconstituted/gain TAV.
- Central Management teams to III MEF for T/E deficiencies, tariff, shelf life issues, gain TAV.
- Once all facilities stand up, central facility will downsize in warehouse space. Central Management Team and facility will remain Dallas

- Central Facility will have overall USMC TAV and centrally manage program shelf life, calibration, and tariff requirements for each facility.
- Organizational maintenance conducted on all assets by CLS staff.

## **8.0 ACTION.**

- A. Capture cost-saving data for support in future briefs.
- B. Address readiness reporting requirements/approach.
- C. Do units continue to procure NBCD Equipment until a COA is selected or is there a moratorium in effect for now?
- D. Identify/Coordinate with CBRNE POC on their campaign plan for any impact on proposed COAs.
- E. How will current/future MARFOR NBCD funding be affected by Reconstitution Plan?
- F. Unit Training Allowances (T/A) will be composed of combat stocks (part of unit T/E) and non-serviceable stocks (coded out IPE, etc). This impacts readiness reporting and funding for support of equipment. Requirement for utilizing Marine Corps definition of T /A.
- G. Will IPE have tariffs or will units be required to produce sizes required when checking equipment out of centralized facilities?
- H. Will MEF HQs provide the NBCD Equipment density list, by unit, and phased unit draw plan to the Centralized facility? (SSSF receives direction from MFR NBCD Officer)
- I. What will be the CSFs plan for IRRs/IMAs drawing IPE (including masks)? Need to address in CLS SOW.
- J. Will USMC Aviation NBCD blue gear remain status quo for storage and reporting? Asset Visibility?
- K. What are industrial base impacts/limitations?
- L. What is MARES requirement for Centralized Facilities? (M17 only MARES reportable item)
- M. Requirement exists to capture all equipment currently on order/backorder and change ship to address once Reconstitution Plan is implemented.
- N. Requirement exists to ensure all assets in theatre at conclusion of MPF reconstitution are redeployed directly to Central Facility.
- O. Is there a near-term requirement to review/adjust facility size requirements to accommodate JPACE, 5 per person, for all armor/aviation units?
- P. There is a current requirement for DEMP reporting to gain visibility of O/H assets.
- Q. Detailed supply accountability procedures necessary at unit level and for receiving facility. See basic outline in separate attachment.
- R. MARFOR G3s develop MEF-level contingency blocks required to initially remain at MEF location during initial Reconstitution/Centralization implementation.
- S. Selected COA implementation should be MEF sequential vice concurrent (I MEF then II MEF).

- T. Requirement to TAG and Track during initial implementation of any COA selected dictates that we have this capability completed, on the shelf, soonest.
- U. 57XX logistics related labor hours required for MCCDC structure review.
- V. Radiation Safety Office POC needs to be involved in COA implementation.
- W. Since Reconstitution plan is/will be based on 4 yr phased buy, possible industrial base impact effects on reconstitution, and we do not currently know impact of combat usage and losses, is there a requirement to prioritize available assets (serviceable unit gear plus new buys) by MEF, in particular I and II MEF? Do we implement Total Force concept and utilize III MEF and MFR assets as collective pool when determining what MEF should hold what overall percentage of their T/E, or Do we gain Centralized Management perspective and timeline approach to being capable of moving assets from one area to another when required?
- X. PAC AND LANT REPS REQUEST COA approach in brief be changed to support on site contingency block buildup and unit T/A. Remaining assets shipped to Central Facility.
- Y. Provide brief to PM, NBC on revised implementation planning approach week of 17-20 June.